

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 5316  
**APPLICANT NAME:** Lake County Watershed Protection District  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Lake County Water Management Program

**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$1,945,481  
**COST MATCH:** \$2,039,778  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$3,985,259

**DESCRIPTION:** The Proposal addresses flood damage reduction, habitat restoration and enhancement, water quality monitoring and improvement, groundwater supply and conjunctive use. The Middle Creek Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration Project will restore 1,650 acres of reclaimed land as wetland, open water and floodplain by decommissioning substandard levees. This application is for a portion of the design costs. The Adobe Creek Conjunctive Use Project will modify the primary spillway of Highland Creek Reservoir to permit additional storage in the spring. The additional storage will be released during the summer and fall to recharge the groundwater. This application is for design and construction costs. The Water Quality Monitoring Program will monitor for mercury hotspots in the Cache and Putah Creek watersheds and monitor groundwater quality to determine the extent of contamination.

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 1

The FED consists of four planning documents. However, no formal documentation that integrates the documents or a schedule for adoption is in the application. With the exception of the Clean Lakes Implementation Plan, three individual plans were formally adopted, for which minutes of adoption are included in the application.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

The applicant indicates the region is an appropriate area for regional management based on continuous planning efforts since the late 1980's. Mapping was limited to GIS shape file and contrary to the description in the various documents. Of the four plans, two of the plans identify the County as their region, one covers the Clear Lake watershed, and one identifies the Big Valley groundwater basin as the regional coverage. Quantitative or qualitative discussion of the water resources within the region, important ecological processes and environmental resources, social and cultural makeup of the regional community, important cultural or social makeup, and describes economic conditions and important trends within the region were found in the supporting documents; however, no umbrella document that describes region and how the four plans are to function together for regional water management were included.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 2

Regional planning objectives are not articulated. The objectives relevant to each plan are described well. However, the methods to determine those objectives are not described, and conflicts are not discussed.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 2

Several water management strategies are identified, but the proposal does not discuss how these strategies will work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives. In addition, although the proposal discusses benefits of each plan, it does not adequately address the benefits from integration of multiple water management strategies.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

Each of the four plans discusses regional priorities specific to their individual concerns. Short- and long-term implementation actions were considered in some plans but not all. All four plans are continuously reviewed and implemented through various oversight committees. The FED provided limited details on how decision making will response to regional changes, response to implementation of projects will be accessed, and project sequencing may be altered based on implementation response. The discussion is general and did not detail the mechanism, procedures, and organization necessary to ensure regional integration.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The four functionally are being implemented on an ongoing basis. Some projects, such as the Middle Creek Flood Control project fulfill implementation strategies of more than one plan. The implementation timelines for some of the plans have passed and no update to the plans was submitted. No overall coordination or structure was identified how the separate plans are to function as an IRWMP. No specific action is identified for the FED; however, action items was identified for each component plans. Linkage or interdependence between the projects is not identified.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

Negative impacts are minimally discussed. In general, negative impacts were implied, as the "no action" alternative is presumed not to have water quality, quantity, or flood control benefits. All projects, plans, and proposals are defined independently. The application demonstrates the impacts and benefits of having a FED verses individual planning. The applicant does address DACs.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The discussion on performance monitoring is applicable to the individual plans. Ongoing monitoring is conducted to assess the performance of the plans; however, discussion that demonstrates their relationship to the FED is absent. The applicant identifies measures that will be used to evaluate project/plan performance, monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adopt project operation and plan implementation based on performance data collected. Data gaps were acknowledged, but the FED did not outline means to fill that gap. Although the application indicates appropriate personnel and the Lake County Resources Management Committee (RMC) will monitor the adequacy of the data and ensure performance, it does not outline the mechanism or protocol the FED will follow.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The current data management consists of the maintenance of an existing Access database. The FED does not include mechanism by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public other than indicating that the data are within the public domain and available upon request. Currently, only groundwater level data is submitted to DWR. The applicant assesses the state of existing monitoring efforts for water supply or water quality. The applicant indicates that if required, data will be integrated into SWAMP or GAMA. The proposal does not address whether the projects will contribute to the statewide data needs.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The applicant indicates that financing for implementation will come from general property tax revenues and State and Federal funding sources. However, no plan for ongoing support and financing of the O&M of implemented projects are presented.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The FED did not identify actions, projects, or studies related to local planning documents. The FED did not demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision makers; although the individual plans have such components. The application does not discuss how local agency planning documents relate to the regional water management strategies and dynamics between the two levels of planning documents. However, the applicant indicates cooperation in the implementation of existing plans that serves as the FED.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposal identifies the existing RMC's role in involving and coordinating among stakeholders. However, not all of the stakeholders have signed on to the committee. Stakeholder involvement and coordination was not integrated to the FED. There was no discussion on environmental justice concerns and limited discussion is found on DAC.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

9

The applicant identifies three projects. The projects are developed from the separate FED component plans and draw upon feasibility, design, and other work in those plans. However, it is uncertain how the projects are consistent with a "regional" plan. The proposed projects are consistent with the RWB's Watershed Management Initiative Chapter, NPS Program, and current and planned TMDLs for the watershed. Two of the projects, for Middle and Adobe Creeks, are described in detail. The Water Quality Monitoring Program consists of two distinct projects covering mercury monitoring and groundwater monitoring. The groundwater monitoring program lacks sufficient explanation. No information is provided that demonstrates that the 4 projects are integrated within the region or would achieve a coherent set of objectives, water management strategy, and providing multiple benefits.

### Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

2

The proposal does not prioritize the projects to regional planning. Of the four projects identified, only three are included in the schedule and budget. The projects relate back to the component plans of the FED.

### Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The application includes cost estimates for the four projects. Three cost estimate summaries are provided, but two are not broken down other than by administrative and planning/design/engineering/environmental costs. The cost estimates do not correspond to some of the identified tasks, such as permit costs or CEQA. Funding match is expected from USACE.

### Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The schedule does not include one of the projects identified as part of the proposal. The schedule is inconsistent with cost estimate. Detail is provided for one of the project, Middle Creek Marsh; however, detail for the remaining projects is lacking.

### Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

8

Overall a good discussion; however, the application is lacking in the description of the current water management system and long-term regional water management needs. There are some inconsistencies in the water quantity needs as the 20-year projection indicates continued water surplus. The applicant states that there will be potential water quality improvements. Local and regional and economic, environmental, and fiscal negative impacts, which would result from not completing the projects, are described.

### Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

0

The applicant did not submit the required attachment.

### Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposed projects meet many of the IRWM Program Preferences. However, the applicant did not demonstrate how combining these projects address multiple benefits.

TOTAL SCORE: 59
-----------------